REMARKS

Claim 1 is now pending in the application. Claims 6 and 8-18 have been cancelled. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant would like to thank Examiners Takele and Bashor for the courtesies extended to his undersigned representative during a telephone interview on July 3, 2008. During that interview, arguments in favor of patentability along the lines set forth below were presented. The examiners opined that the claim language, in particular step a), read on the steps of sequentially entering **all** of the letters of a word to be input. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiners to reconsider their position. A skilled practitioner after having the benefit of studying Applicant's specification, and certainly after reviewing the arguments made during prosecution, would never construe the claim language that broadly.

Paragraph 0004 of Applicant's publication (U.S. 2006/0082555) talks about the prior art, admitting that, "all the letters of the word from the first letter to the last one must be typed in order". In the Summary of the invention, Applicant explicitly teaches that the problems of the prior art can be solved "if only a first and last letters of a word to be input are typed in." Thus, the claim language must be reasonably construed as being limited to sequentially typing in only the first letter and then the last letter to perform the search.

Therefore, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested for this reason and the reasons set forth below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6 and 8-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0012642) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,686,902). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for "typing in first and last letters of a word to be input, and pressing a function key." Applicant submits that Yang and Lee, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these limitations. It is possible to input, to embodiments of the claimed invention, a word with only two alphabets, i.e., the first and the last alphabets instead of inputting all alphabets of target word. In contrast, the cited references require inputting each character of a target word. Thus, the claimed invention differs from the cited art.

Further, in the claimed invention, the last character is not used to simply limit the number of searched words and it is used with consideration of ratio of overlapping. In other words, the ratio of overlapping is higher in the front character and lower in the latter character. For example, in searching words beginning with "ab" in the first and second characters, approximately 350 words such as "about", "above", "able", "abruptly", "ability" can be found. Embodiments of the claimed invention can remarkably reduce the number of matched words by searching with criteria such as beginning with 'a', finishing with 'b' and comprising with more than 6 characters. Thus, it is more effective to search words with 'b' as the last character than as the second character.

Thus, the claimed invention makes it possible to input words with remarkably fast speed in comparison with the cited art, because in the search, 'the last character' is used to reduce the number of matched words.

Further, claim 1 calls for "wherein a cursor moves in front of the last letter so as to enable an additional letter to be input." In other words, if a function key is pushed down, the cursor moves to the front of the last character in order to make it possible to input additional character. After inputting the first and the last characters, the cursor moves to the front of the last character and becomes ready to input the next character.

In contrast, Yang and Lee are silent about inputting additional character after inputting the last character. In Yang and Lee, it is only possible to input characters according to the order from the front character, and it is not possible to input the middle character after input of the last character.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 defines over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 3, 2008

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/PFD/evm